

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 10, 12 and 14-20 are pending, Claims 1, 10, 16 and 17 having been amended by way of the present amendment, and Claims 9, 11 and 13 having been previously canceled.

In reply, Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the identification of allowable subject matter.

Claim 1 has been amended to define the wireless base station as including a message processing unit that is configured to extract multicast-related control data from a second message received by a receiver unit. This multicast-related control data indicates multicasting service states of neighboring wireless base stations. A determination unit then determines whether the wireless base station provides the multicasting service for the plurality of wireless terminals based on the multicasting service states of the neighboring base stations indicated by the multicast-related control data. Support for this amendment is found in the specification, for example, at page 18, lines 14-29, and therefore, no new matter is added.

An advantage of such approach, is that it is possible to avoid redundancy of the multicasting service provided for overlapping service areas. Likewise, it is also possible for the wireless base station to make efficient use of the radio resources and lower the maintenance and operating cost of this system (see e.g., specification page 18, lines 25-29).

Kojima is directed to mobile communication system having surface sub-areas that are independently assigned special services. As is recognized in the outstanding Office Action, the special services do not including multicasting services. However, this is not the main point of the present argument (because the outstanding Office Action relies on Rune for the

disclosure of a multicasting service). Rather, in Kojima the base station 5 communicates with the mobile stations in the service area and the control station 7. However, Kojima neither teaches nor suggests that the wireless base station receives multicasting service states of the neighboring wireless base stations. Nor does Kojima determine whether the wireless base station provides a multicasting service for the plurality of wireless terminals, based on the multicasting service states. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Kojima does not teach all the features of amended Claim 1.

Rune is asserted for its disclosure of a multicasting service, but Rune is deficient with regard to using multicast-related control data indicating the multicasting service states of the neighboring wireless base stations. Thus, Rune does not disclose a determination unit that determines whether the wireless base station provides the multicasting service based on the multicasting service states of the neighboring base stations indicted by the multicast-control data. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that no matter how Kojima is combined with Rune, the combination does not teach or suggest all of the elements of amended Claim 1.

Because Claims 2-8 and 16-19 depend from Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims also patentably define over the asserted prior art. Although of different scope, Claim 10 also includes the feature of a wireless base station configured to determine whether the wireless base station provides the multicasting service for the plurality of wireless terminals, based on the multicasting service states of the neighboring wireless base stations indicted by the second state signal. Therefore, Claim 10 is also believed to define over the asserted prior art.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-8, 10, 12 and 14-20, as amended patentably defines over the asserted prior art. The present application is therefore believed to

be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850